

## REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated December 27, 2002, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on January 27, 2003. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

I. Claims 1-32 are drawn to methods for polishing a substrate, classified in class 438, subclass 692.

II. Claims 33-34 are drawn to an apparatus for polishing a substrate, classified in class 156, subclass 345.13.

Applicants elect claims 1-32, Group I, with traverse. The Examiner asserts that the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus, such as by using a manually operated apparatus instead of the as claimed computer-controlled apparatus.

The apparatus claims of Group II, claims 33-34, recite an apparatus having a computer based controller configured to cause the system to perform a method comprising polishing the substrate at a first relative linear velocity between about 600 mm/second and about 1675 mm/second at the center of the substrate and polishing the substrate at a second relative linear velocity between about 20 mm/second and about 600 mm/second at the center of the substrate. Thus, the apparatus and controller perform the method for polishing a substrate as recited in claim 29 and is therefore not properly restricted. The Examiner has not identified any support for asserting that such a process can be controlled manually. Further, separate searches would likely identify the same references for the claims of Group I and Group II, as identified by the Examiner.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal or modification of the restriction requirement to permit prosecution of claims 1-34.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Keith M. Tackett  
Registration No. 32,008  
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.  
3040 Post Oak Blvd., Suite 1500  
Houston, TX 77056  
Telephone: (713) 623-4844  
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846  
Attorney for Applicant(s)